

Suwannee County Schools

Branford High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	0

Branford High School

405 REYNOLDS ST NE, Branford, FL 32008

bhs.suwannee.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Terry Huddleston

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Suwannee County School Board on 9/22/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Branford High School

405 REYNOLDS ST NE, Branford, FL 32008

bhs.suwannee.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	76%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	18%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Suwannee County School Board on 9/22/2020.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Branford High School will educate all students in a safe and supportive learning environment that will develop life-long learners and productive citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Branford High School will be a system of excellence ensuring all students are prepared for personal success.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Huddleston, Terry	Principal	<p>The Principal is the instructional leader of the school and ultimately responsible for all curriculum, instruction, professional development, career and tech ed programs, student activities and community involvement. The Principal supervises all instructional and non-instructional personnel. The Guidance Counselor and two Assistant Principals compose the administrative team.</p> <p>The Counselor works with approximately 700 students, grades 6-12 and fills a variety of rolls in a small school.</p> <p>The Assistant Principals share responsibilities as directed by the Principal. One Assistant Principal is assigned to curriculum, testing, and ESE. The other Assistant Principal coordinates facility operations, student discipline, CTE programs and is the middle school administrative contact.</p> <p>All members of the team are assigned instructional areas, but there many times that situations are not clear cut, which requires good communication between the group.</p> <p>The administrative team meets every Monday at 9:05 to discuss any items that are important to the effective, smooth operation of the school.</p>
Wood, Angela	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Wood works extensively with all students and their educational needs. She is the lead person for the development of the master schedule, ESE students, graduation requirements and dual enrollment.
Manna, Carl	Assistant Principal	Mr. Manna is responsible for student discipline, facilities, assists with the master schedule, safety contact and is the middle school administrative contact.
Poole, Alicia	School Counselor	Mrs. Poole is responsible for all aspects of student affairs including student records review, Bright Futures, scholarships, college application assistance and Dual Enrollment. Facilitate ESE meetings, IEP and 504 reviews, maintain ESE records and monitor student accommodations. Assist with all state testing programs. Meet with students and parents in regards to the emotional, social and academic needs of individual students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Terry Huddleston

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	84%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	107	109	101	94	89	86	91	677	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	43	43	27	31	22	22	215	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	10	2	2	30	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	22	11	4	6	5	62	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	22	23	25	20	13	17	133	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	21	14	14	13	19	8	112	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	25	26	23	20	13	11	135

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/28/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	3	6	3	2	13	47	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	22	27	22	12	8	118	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	30	27	27	28	20	32	196	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	12	13	17	17	6	10	90

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	3	6	3	2	13	47
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	22	27	22	12	8	118
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	30	27	27	28	20	32	196

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	12	13	17	17	6	10	90

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	53%	50%	56%	49%	42%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	49%	51%	51%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	42%	42%	38%	38%	41%
Math Achievement	55%	46%	51%	53%	40%	49%
Math Learning Gains	57%	43%	48%	57%	39%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	41%	45%	47%	38%	39%
Science Achievement	64%	63%	68%	55%	66%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	64%	63%	73%	74%	70%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	58%	46%	12%	54%	4%
	2018	47%	41%	6%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	46%	42%	4%	52%	-6%
	2018	49%	44%	5%	51%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
08	2019	46%	47%	-1%	56%	-10%
	2018	51%	51%	0%	58%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
09	2019	52%	47%	5%	55%	-3%
	2018	43%	45%	-2%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
10	2019	46%	51%	-5%	53%	-7%
	2018	33%	44%	-11%	53%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	64%	45%	19%	55%	9%
	2018	57%	38%	19%	52%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	67%	50%	17%	54%	13%
	2018	60%	44%	16%	54%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	29%	30%	-1%	46%	-17%
	2018	13%	19%	-6%	45%	-32%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	54%	52%	2%	48%	6%
	2018	49%	54%	-5%	50%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	66%	7%	67%	6%
2018	56%	64%	-8%	65%	-9%
Compare		17%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	68%	-4%	71%	-7%
2018	65%	61%	4%	71%	-6%
Compare		-1%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	60%	64%	-4%	70%	-10%
2018	61%	64%	-3%	68%	-7%
Compare		-1%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	44%	-6%	61%	-23%
2018	41%	45%	-4%	62%	-21%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	59%	2%	57%	4%
2018	55%	47%	8%	56%	-1%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		6%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	30	44	30	31	41	22	40	41		100	10
ELL	30	40		45							
BLK	25	58		31	38						
HSP	48	53	64	63	60		58	44	63		
MUL	62	69		58	42						
WHT	54	54	35	55	58	48	67	66	75	97	80
FRL	47	52	37	51	54	42	57	53	56	98	68
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	33	22	21	39	42	25	33			
ELL	29	62		33	58						
BLK	31	42		27	50		10				
HSP	42	46	33	52	56	60	38	77			
MUL	30	30									
WHT	47	40	29	48	48	34	60	64	71	97	79
FRL	43	40	33	46	47	38	50	59	66	94	62
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	13	33	34	15	33	25	55	43		83	20
ELL	15	27		20	20						
BLK	12	29		20	47						
HSP	35	40	24	44	45	20	62	50			
MUL	36										
WHT	52	53	40	57	59	53	55	77	80	94	50
FRL	43	47	35	47	53	53	48	70	65	95	40

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	683
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	38
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	58
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component with the lowest performance was the ELA Lowest Quartile with a score of 40%. The 2016, 2017 and 2018 scores were 37%, 38% and 30%. the 2019 score was 10% higher than the 2018 score.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Social Studies Achievement was the only tested area that showed any decline. The score dropped by 1%. A comparison of the student's ELA score and the same student's Social Studies score did not reveal any statistical anomaly that would explain a 1% decline.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Eighth grade math had the greatest gap when compared to the state average, -17%. Scores were up 16% when compared to the previous year. Progress monitoring of standards as they were taught resulted in a greater understanding of student mastery

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELA Learning Gains showed the most improvement with a 14% increase. A greater emphasis was placed on teaching standards with fidelity and targeted progress monitoring.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two potential areas of concern are student absences and the number of Level 1 students 6-10.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Improve US History and Civics EOC scores to 70%.
2. Biology EOC pass rates.
3. ELA scores including lowest quartile students
4. ESSA Federal Index Needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Civics and US History EOC pass rates BHS scores are consistently below the state average. AP US History and Human Geography pass rate will improve from 2019-2020 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	State test pass rates should improve to 70% and AP pass rate will improve to 40% of students to pass.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terry Huddleston (terry.huddleston@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A complete breakdown of standards taught. 2. Implement progress monitoring. 3. Search surrounding area for schools that exceed the state average, review their curriculum and implement necessary changes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Best practices that continuously produce results above the state average should produce similar results. 2. A review of standards taught and standards tested compared to student results provides insight into curriculum changes.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Review standards that are tested to determine scope and sequence.
2. Analyze results to determine specific areas of instruction.
3. Progress monitoring.
4. Blended learning via Edgenuity

Person Responsible Carl Manna (carl.manna@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible Angela Wood (angela.wood@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible Carl Manna (carl.manna@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus	Biology EOC pass rates
Description and Rationale:	Biology EOC scores improved by 17 pts as compared to 2018 scores. The Science PLC wants to maintain this year's level of success.
Measurable Outcome:	Biology EOC scores will maintain current pass rate scores or improve by any amount.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Wood (angela.wood@suwannee.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Science PLC members will monitor student progress monthly during PLC meetings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC members are continuing to develop a Master Vocabulary Program to provide continuous integration of biological terms grades 6-12.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC presentation during planning that examined EOC scores from the past two years.
2. PLC will develop Master Vocabulary list during August PD day.
3. PLC will share list with Admin. and all science teachers.
4. PLC will continue to develop "stand alone" Canvas courses 6-12.

Person Responsible Angela Wood (angela.wood@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

No description entered

Person Responsible Carl Manna (carl.manna@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: The ELA PLC reviewed the last two year's scores and propose to maintain current standard levels of proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: Students should maintain current level of proficiency or any measurable level of improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angela Wood (angela.wood@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The addition of AP courses as well as "looping" students with the same teacher for consecutive years will provide a means of differentiation (more specified one-on-one) and advancements in rigorous texts and instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Due to previous inconsistencies in curriculum, curriculum mapping and grade level as well as culturally appropriate materials have been streamlined and organized for teacher and student use.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLC presentation during pre-planning.
2. Looping students and teachers.
3. Literacy plan involves student choice novel assignments for each semester.
4. AP, Dual Enrollment, and honors courses improved with documented rigor.
5. A vertical review of student data trends by grade level will indicate specific strands or standards that require additional instruction.
6. Blended learning using Edgenuity for all students.

Person Responsible Angela Wood (angela.wood@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESSA Federal Index. SWD students scored 39% and Black students scored 38% as recorded on the ESSA federal index report.
---	--

Measurable Outcome: Both groups will increase by 10 percentage points.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Angela Wood (angela.wood@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: These students are a fairly small group of students within the BHS population. They can be easily identified and tracked by teachers, admin and guidance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These students are listed on the Federal Index. We will implement the action steps listed below.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Positively identify these students with help from the district office.
2. Meet with teachers of the students to address needs.
3. Provide one-on-one or small group instruction for SWD students.
4. ESE support teachers will monitor SWD students academic achievement.
5. Blended learning via Edgenuity.
6. Credit Recovery for students needing to retake a course or work at a slower pace.
7. Critical Thinking class for Grades 6-8.

Person Responsible Terry Huddleston (terry.huddleston@suwannee.k12.fl.us)

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Parent involvement is a very important relationship between the school, parents, and stake holders. BHS is located in a very small rural community in North Central Florida, where virtually everyone knows each other. All activities at the school are a community affair. Athletic events, Band/Chorus programs, academic award ceremonies and graduation unite the community. This year BHS will provide multiple opportunities to build relationships by: * Hosting an ELL parent night with interpreters for ELL parents. * In-coming 6th graders participated in the Buccaneer Camp, which acclimated parents and students to BHS. * Addressing concerns from the community or parents. * Providing information to parents via website, Canvas, One Call, Remind, Facebook, the marquee, and the Buccaneer Drift. * Providing a parent resource center in the media center. * Hosting the annual Title 1 Parent Meeting. * Virtual Orientation for all 6th-12th grade students prior to the first day of school. * Having a School Advisory Council meeting at least 6 times a year. * Hosting a Financial Aid and Scholarship night. * Providing students an opportunity to participate in a College Fair. * Hosting a Dual-Enrollment Parent Meeting. * Athletic teams will have parent meeting. * Band will host parent meetings. * FFA will host parent and community meetings. * The 3rd Annual Bespy's Athletic Awards ceremony will be held in May. * Two SCSB Board meetings will be held at BHS. BHS has a Student Ambassador who attends all SCSB meetings.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.